DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 971 HE 014 406

AUTHOR Hairston, Creasie Finney, Ed.
TITLE A Survey of Graduates of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. School of Social Work.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 90p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; *College Graduates; Education Work Relationship; *Employment Patterns; Females; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Questionnaires; Relevance (Education); *Salaries; Salary Wage Differentials; *Social Work
IDENTIFIERS *University of Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Findings are reported of a survey of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work (UTSSW) alumni conducted during 1978, which sought to identify ways to improve the school's graduate program, to strengthen its ability to serve its graduates, and to develop further knowledge in the area of social work manpower. The first paper, "A Descriptive Study of Graduates of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work," by Creasie Finney Hairston, is the general survey report and makes up the bulk of the document. The respondents, their work settings, and their views about educational preparation and work experiences are described. Responses of persons trained in the school's treatment specialization are compared with the responses of those trained in the administration and planning specialization. Implications for curriculum development are noted. In the second article, "Profile of 20 UTSSW Black Alumni," by Art Knighton, the respondents are examined to raise issues and identify areas for future research, including why there was such a low survey response among blacks and why there were no black alumni respondents working in social welfare administration and planning areas. "Employment Patterns and Salaries of Female Graduates of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work," by Claire F. Lowry, compares male and female employment patterns, administrative responsibilities and salaries. No clear indications of the changing status of women in social work were found. The survey instrument is appended. (Author/LC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209971

A SURVEY OF GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Edited by

Creasie Finney Hairston, Ph.D.
University of Tennessee School of Social Work
Knoxville, Tennessee

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ of Tenn - School Social Work

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

March 1980

HE 014406

These materials present the findings of a survey of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work alumni conducted during 1978. The papers were assembled and edited by Creasie Finney Hairston, Ph.D.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, handicap, or veteran status in provision of educational opportunities or employment opportunities and benefits.

UTK does not discriminate on the basis of sex or handicap in the education programs and activities which it operates, pursuant to the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Pub. L. 92-318; and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. 93-112, respectively. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

Inquiries concerning Title IX and Section 504 should be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration, 525 Andy Holt Tower, (615) 974-4391. Charges of violation of the above policy should also be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

Copyright 1980 by the University of Tennessee School of Social Work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The University of Tennessee School of Social Work (UTSSW) Alumni Survey Report is a product of many people. Dr. Robert Holloway, with the assistance of a research task force composed of UTSSW faculty, designed the survey and implemented the data processing phases of this study. At the time, Dr. Holloway was Assistant Professor at the Nashville Branch of UTSSW. He is currently a faculty member at Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

The School's Office of Continuing Social Work Education, under the direction of Ron Green, carried the major responsibility for coordination of the data-gathering process, and Mr. Michael Bremseth of that office provided technical assistance in other study phases as well. Dr. Creasie Finney Hairston, Dr. Art Knighton and Ms. Claire F. Lowry analyzed the study data and prepared the reports which appear in this volume.

Other persons who contributed to the success of this project include Dean Ben Granger, who saw the need for a study of this nature and made available the necessary resources to carry it out; the alumni who responded to the rather lengthy questionnaire; and the secretarial staff who typed many drafts. In addition, Mary Anne Blazek and Sally Johnson provided editorial assistance and Joyce Payne and Pam Jones performed the word processing which brought this report to its final form.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	i
II. A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK by Creasie Finney Hairston	1
III. PROFILE OF 20 UTSSW BLACK ALUMNI by Art Knighton	35
IV. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AND SALARIES OF FEMALE GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK by Claire F. Lowry	50
APPENDIX (Survey)	69

I. INTRODUCTION

The papers in this volume present the findings of a survey of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work alumni conducted during 1978. The survey was undertaken to identify ways to improve the School's graduate educational program, to strengthen its ability to serve its graduates and to develop further knowledge in the area of social work manpower.

The first paper by Creasie Finney Hairston is the general survey report. The author describes the respondents, their work settings and presents their views about educational preparation and work experiences. She compares the responses of persons trained in the School's treatment specialization with the responses of those trained in the administration and planning specialization in several areas, and discusses key findings which have implications for curriculum development.

In the second article, Art Knighton examines the twenty black alumni who responded to the survey. He makes no attempts to generalize beyond this group but instead uses the findings to raise issues and identify areas for future research.

Claire F. Lowry compares male and female employment patterns, administrative responsibilities and salaries in the last article. She also provides information on the employment patterns of a relatively new group of graduates, "re-entry women," older students who have entered or re-entered the work force after spending several years as homemakers.

II. A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

by Creasie Finney Hairston

One approach to assessing the education and training used in preparation for a profession is to survey persons who have received that training and are practicing the profession. A survey of graduates of a training program can, among other things, identify gaps and congruencies between the curriculum and actual practice in the field, point to job market needs and trends, identify varying levels of competency among graduates with different characteristics, and assess attitudes of the practitioners.

In 1978 the University of Tennessee School of Social Work (UTSSW) conducted a survey of its graduates as one means of obtaining information that could be used in improving its educational program. This report presents the findings of that survey. It is a general summary of the demographic characteristics of the graduates, their work experiences, assessment of their work performance, and their views about UTSSW experiences.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK*

The primary objective of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work is to educate and train persons for practice and leadership roles in the social work profession and in social welfare. UTSSW is a fully accredited, two-year, graduate professional school. Satisfactory completion of its academic program leads to the Master of Science in Social Work (MSSW) degree.

The School's primary objective is achieved by providing a core curriculum and two areas of specialization: social work treatment and

---

*Material presented in this section was taken from The UTSSW Accreditation Progress Report (1973-1976), Volume 1, Submitted to the Council on Social Work Education, March, 1976.

social work administration and planning. The School includes branches in Knoxville, Memphis, and Nashville and an Office of Continuing Social Work Education (OCSWE). It offers a full-time, two-year (six-quarter) program of study, a limited number of opportunities for planned part-time study, and an accelerated program which enables students who meet specific entrance requirements to complete the MSSW in four quarters.

UTSSW was founded in 1942 by three institutions of higher education in Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College, and Scarritt College. It officially became the University of Tennessee School of Social Work in 1951. The full-time, two-year course of study was implemented in Memphis in 1965 and in Knoxville in 1968. The Office of Continuing Social Work Education was begun in 1972 and a full-time director appointed in 1974.

The curriculum is designed to provide the student with the basic components of professional competence. The program includes a core curriculum, a specialization in one of two areas--social work treatment (treatment) or social welfare administration and planning (SWAP)--and concurrent field practice. The specialization in administration and planning was not offered until 1969.

The core curriculum contributes to the process of socialization and professional identification and presents students with a comprehensive knowledge base from which to operate as practitioners, administrators and planners. The specialization in social work treatment provides the educational basis for practice with individuals, families and groups in order to enhance their social functioning, ameliorate problems and prevent social dysfunction. The specialization in social welfare administration and planning, on the other hand, provides the educational basis

for leadership in the design, implementation and continued delivery of effective human services and related programs at local, state and regional levels.

STUDY PROCEDURES

In June 1978, OCSWE mailed a questionnaire to all persons on its master mailing list who were identified as having received the MSSW from UTSSW. A total of 1,450 individuals were so identified.

OCSWE's master mailing list was originally compiled from the alumni mailing list maintained by the University of Tennessee Alumni Office and several other mailing lists obtained from social work organizations in Tennessee. The list is updated regularly and names of participants in OCSWE events and members of each year's UTSSW graduating class are added.

The questionnaire was a modification of one used in a similar study conducted by the University of Michigan in 1972. It contained inquiries about graduates' work settings, work experiences, work performance and views about the UTSSW program.

Four hundred and eighty-five completed questionnaires were returned, representing a 34 percent return rate. Because descriptive data about alumni on the mailing list were not available, a comparison of survey respondents with nonrespondents was not possible. A comparison of respondents with all graduates of the school was likewise not possible because UTSSW does not routinely compile data of this nature on graduates. This report is, therefore, limited to a discussion of the responses on the 485 completed questionnaires. No attempt is made to generalize beyond the study respondents. The findings, though tentative, are useful for exploratory purposes.

RESULTS

Presentation of the survey findings is limited, for the most part, to results obtained from the total sample. The major exception is that results for graduates who specialized in treatment are compared with results for graduates who specialized in administration and planning in several key areas. These subgroups were selected for comparison because their educational and work experiences are assumed to be different and, therefore, to carry different implications for curriculum development. Because 1971 was the first year in which persons in the SWAP specialization were graduated, only the responses given by graduates after 1970 are used in these comparisons.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic characteristics of the 485 respondents are described in the following paragraphs.

The majority of respondents were white (94 percent), female (64 percent), married (67 percent) and under 50 years of age (75 percent). More than half (59 percent) received the MSSW degree before the age of 30, and the majority (90 percent) received the degree by the time they were 42. Eighty-five percent were then employed as social workers and 98 percent had been employed as a social worker at some time since receiving the MSSW degree.

The earliest year in which the MSSW was reported to have been received was 1940 and the most recent year was 1978. Two percent of the respondents received the MSSW in the 1940's, 16 percent in the 1950's, 32 percent in the 1960's and 50 percent in the 1970's. Eighty-three percent received the degree in 1975 or earlier. Slightly more than three-fourths (77 percent) specialized in the treatment sequence as

students; 21 percent specialized in administration and planning; and two percent had a dual specialization. Two-thirds (66 percent) were graduated from the Nashville Branch, one-fourth (25 percent) from the Knoxville Branch, and the remainder (9 percent) from the Memphis Branch. Approximately half (51 percent) earned $16,000 or more per year at the time of the survey. Ninety-seven percent earned $10,000 or more per year; 27 percent earned $20,000 or more per year; and six percent earned $30,000 or more.

Twenty-five percent of the graduates had no experience in social work or human services prior to entering the program. Thirty-nine percent had some experience but less than two years, and 36 percent had over two years' experience. Fifty percent resided in Tennessee prior to entering the program and an additional 33 percent resided in the Southeastern states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Georgia, and Arkansas. Most (88 percent) entered school via the regular two-year program. Six percent entered on a part-time basis and seven percent entered via the accelerated program.

The demographic characteristics of the 242 persons who graduated after 1970 (50 percent of the total sample) are similar to, and at the same time different from, those of the total sample. Most were white (92 percent), female (64 percent), married (65 percent) and under 50 years of age (96 percent). About two-thirds (68 percent) had received the MSSW degree by the time they were 30 years of age and most, 92 percent, had received the degree before the age of 42. The overwhelming majority had practiced social work at some point since graduation (97 percent) and were then employed as social workers (93 percent) as well. Nearly all (96 percent) earned $10,000 or more per year

at the time of the survey and about one-fourth (29 percent) earned $16,000 or more per year. Fewer than one-tenth (9 percent) earned over $20,000 per year. About half (52 percent) earned between $12,000 and $16,000 per year.

Thirty percent of the persons who graduated after 1970 had no experience as social workers prior to entering the School of Social Work. Thirty-five percent had some experience but less than two years, and the remainder (35 percent) had over two years of experience. Sixty percent resided in Tennessee prior to entering the program and an additional 22 percent resided in the Southeastern states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina.

About an equal number of the post-1970 graduates were graduated from the Knoxville (42 percent) and Nashville (43 percent) branches. The remainder (15 percent) were graduated from the Memphis branch. Sixty-five percent specialized in the treatment sequence, 32 percent specialized in the SWAP sequence and three percent had a dual specialization. Females tended to specialize in treatment (74 percent), whereas males tended to be equally split between the two specializations. Forty-seven percent of the males specialized in treatment, 47 percent specialized in SWAP and seven percent had a dual specialization. The majority (81 percent) entered school via the regular two-year program. Five percent entered on a part-time basis and the remaining 13 percent entered via the accelerated program.

Except for the sex difference which has already been discussed, graduates who specialized in treatment (hereafter referred to as treatment graduates) differed from those who specialized in SWAP (hereafter referred to as SWAP graduates) only in level of experience and area of

residence. Thirty-two percent of the treatment specialists, as compared to 23 percent of the SWAP graduates, had no experience in social work or human services prior to entering the program. Forty-one percent of the SWAP graduates, as compared with 30 percent of the treatment graduates, had over two years of experience in social work or human services prior to entering the program. Sixty-three percent of those in the treatment specialization resided in Tennessee prior to entering the program and another 19 percent resided in other Southeastern states. The corresponding percentages for SWAP graduates are 43 and 27.

In comparison with the total sample, a greater percentage of the persons graduated after 1970 had received the MSSW by the time they were 30 years of age; had resided in Tennessee prior to entering the program, although about the same percentage resided in the Southeast; and had no experience in social work prior to entering the program.

As compared to all graduates, a greater percentage of those who were graduated after 1970 earned less than $16,000 per year at the time of the survey, graduated from the Memphis and Knoxville branches, and were then currently employed as social workers.

Work Experiences

Work experiences of the graduates were explored by asking several questions about work settings and the type of work performed.

Work setting

UTSSW alumni were employed in a range of human service settings at the time of the survey. The response categories checked by the largest number of respondents were community mental health centers (16 percent), public welfare agencies (12 percent), health settings (11 percent), and mental hospitals (9 percent).

The majority (61 percent) worked in public agencies. Twenty-eight percent were employed in private agencies and 12 percent were employed in both public and private agencies. Although one or more graduates were found in a total of 40 different states, most were concentrated in the Southeast. Forty-seven percent are currently working in Tennessee and another 31 percent were concentrated in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, North Carolina and South Carolina.

Most UTSSW graduates responding to the survey worked in city or suburban areas. Fifty-two percent of the respondents worked in an urban area, 11 percent in a suburban area and 21 percent in a small city. Rural communities accounted for only 15 percent of the responses. Twenty percent of the total sample worked in urban areas classified as low income.

To determine if there had been marked differences in the graduates' work settings over the years, the 293 (60 percent) respondents who had held social work positions in more than one job setting were asked questions about their first job. The 49 persons (10 percent of the total sample) who were not then employed as social workers, but who had been in the past, also responded to these questions.

Descriptions of first job work settings were quite similar to those jobs held at the time of the survey. Table 1 shows the percentage of (then) current job settings and first job settings that fell within each descriptive category.

Table 1 shows that, like the (then) current job, the majority of respondents' first jobs were in agencies that employed more than one social worker, in the Southeast (with about half in Tennessee), in urban areas, and in public agencies. The most noticeable differences

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF (THEN) CURRENT JOBS AND FIRST JOBS
BY TYPE OF WORK SETTING*

WORK SETTING	CURRENT JOB	FIRST JOB
Service Setting		
Public Welfare	12	19
Community Mental Health	16	12
Child Welfare	6	13
Health	11	6
Mental Hospitals	9	10
College/University	7	1
Family Agency	6	7
Private Practice	3	0
Auspices		
Public	59	63
Private	28	29
Public/Private	12	10
Other MSW's in the Work Setting	87	81
Type Community		
Urban (including low-income)	52	54
Suburban	11	6
Small City	21	24
Rural	15	12
Urban low-income	21	16
Area U.S.A.		
Tennessee	47	53
Southeast (not including Tennessee)	28	31

*Numbers refer to percentage of persons in each category.

occur in the type of agency. Thirty-two percent of the respondents who had held more than one job worked in public welfare and child welfare agencies on their first job. Only 18 percent of those employed as social workers at the time of the survey worked in these types of agencies. A larger percentage of current job settings, as compared with first job settings, tended to be in health settings, colleges and universities. There was also a small change from first jobs to current jobs in private practice. No alumni who had held more than one job indicated that their first job was in private practice; however, three percent of those currently employed as social workers were in private practice.

In addition to comparing work settings for first jobs with work settings for (then) current jobs for the total sample, work settings for SWAP graduates were compared with those for treatment graduates. Differences in both type and auspices of agency were found. As to type of agency, the categories checked most frequently by treatment graduates were community mental health (19 percent), health (17 percent), mental hospitals (11 percent), family agencies (9 percent) and residential institutions (16 percent). In contrast, the SWAP graduates checked public welfare (21 percent), mental hospitals (12 percent), child welfare (9 percent), health (6 percent) and residential institutions (6 percent). It should be noted that five percent of the treatment graduates, as compared to 14 percent of the SWAP graduates, provided responses that were not covered by the categories specified for type of agency. With regard to agency auspices, more SWAP graduates (64 percent) than treatment graduates (53 percent) worked in public agencies.

Fifty-seven percent of the persons who graduated after 1970 then practiced in Tennessee and an additional 23 percent in other South-

eastern states. Ninety percent of the SWAP graduates, as compared to 74 percent of the treatment graduates, were then practicing in the Southeast. Fifty-six percent of the treatment graduates and 63 percent of the SWAP graduates practiced in Tennessee.

Type of Work Performed

The majority of UTSSW graduates were then either caseworkers or administrators. Of the total number of respondents, 44 percent indicated casework as the major method used and 37 percent indicated administration. Seven percent indicated family therapy occupied most of their time and another two percent listed group work as the major method. Community practice, policy formulation and analysis, and research combined accounted for less than four percent of the responses. When post-1970 graduates only are considered, more treatment graduates (62 percent) than SWAP graduates (25 percent) utilized casework as the major method; and a greater percentage of SWAP graduates (58 percent) than treatment graduates (19 percent) utilized administration as the major method. Policy formulation and analysis, community practice and research combined accounted for the major method of 11 percent of the SWAP graduates and two percent of the treatment graduates.

To determine the nature and level of work activity engaged in by graduates, respondents were asked to select, from a list, the major activities performed in their jobs and indicate to which one they gave the most time in their (then) current job. The responses for major activities performed appear in Table 2; responses for the major activity to which the most time was given appear in Table 3.

TABLE 2

MAJOR WORK ACTIVITIES PERFORMED IN (THEN) CURRENT JOB

ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE LISTING AS A MAJOR ACTIVITY
Direct service to individual clients	58
Direct service to groups of unrelated clients	25
Direct service to clients meeting in family groups	29
Acting as client advocate	37
Staff development and training	46
Supervising other staff members	49
Offering consultation to staff members	56
Attending staff meetings	68
Budgeting/financial planning	26
Writing proposals for funding	17
Fund raising	7
Planning and carrying out research	11
Writing (reports, papers, articles, etc.)	44
Helping to develop new programs	43
Offering consultation to other agencies	39
Meeting with representatives of community agencies	50
Organizing community groups	10
Meeting with community groups	31
Meeting with public officials	22
Teaching	27
Direct service to caregivers	17
Other	8

TABLE 3

MAJOR ACTIVITY OCCUPYING MOST OF GRADUATES' TIME IN (THEN) CURRENT JOB

ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE LISTING AS A MAJOR ACTIVITY
Direct service to individual clients	42
Direct service to groups of unrelated clients	1
Direct service to clients meeting in family groups	4
Acting as client advocate	1
Staff development and training	3
Supervising other staff members	22
Offering consultation to staff members	3
Attending staff meetings	1
Budgeting/financial planning	3
Writing proposals for funding	0
Fund raising	1
Planning and carrying out research	1
Writing (reports, papers, articles, etc.)	3
Helping to develop new programs	3
Offering consultation to other agencies	2
Meeting with representatives of community agencies	1
Organizing community groups	0
Meeting with community groups	0
Meeting with public officials	0
Teaching	5
Direct service to caregivers	1
Other	4

As can be seen in Table 2, direct service to individuals and families was the major service activity in which respondents were engaged. Fifty-eight percent selected this as a major activity and 42 percent stated that it was the activity which consumed most of their time. The other direct-service activities which were checked more frequently were acting as a client advocate, mentioned by 37 percent; service to groups of unrelated clients, mentioned by 25 percent; and direct service to clients meeting in family groups, mentioned by 29 percent.

In contrast to services to individuals and families, involvement in community organization and planning activities was limited. When it did occur, it appeared to be done by persons who carried major responsibility for other kinds of tasks. Table 3 shows that fewer than five percent of the total sample listed any community organization and/or planning type activity as the major activity which occupied most of their time. This low involvement was also reflected in responses to the major method graduates used in their work: fewer than one percent of the respondents listed community organization as the major method.

Respondents were involved somewhat in activities which utilized community practice strategies and techniques. Table 2 shows that 50 percent met with representatives of community agencies; 30 percent offered consultation to other agencies; 10 percent organized community groups; 31 percent met with community groups; 22 percent met with public officials; and 43 percent helped develop new programs.

Like direct services to individuals and families, supervision of other staff members was a major activity of the graduates. Forty-nine percent indicated supervision was a major activity, with 22 percent indicating that they spent most of their time performing it.

Supervision involves work with persons having different educational backgrounds. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents supervised MSSW's in their (then) current job, 37 percent supervised non-MSSW social workers, and 16 percent supervised MSSW students. Two-thirds of the respondents were not closely supervised themselves, however, and one-fourth were not supervised at all. About half (49 percent) of those who had held more than one social work job since graduating were not closely supervised on their first job, and eight percent were not supervised at all.

As with major method, differences emerge when SWAP graduates are compared to treatment graduates with respect to major activities performed on the job. Table 4 shows, by specialization, the responses post-1970 graduates gave to the question, "What major activities do you perform in your current job?"

Table 4 shows that while some SWAP and treatment graduates listed each of the categories as a major activity for them, the nature of such tasks for the majority of the two groups differed considerably. Larger percentages of treatment than SWAP graduates performed direct services to individuals, families and groups, and client advocacy. Larger percentages of SWAP as opposed to treatment graduates performed staff development and training, supervision of staff, program development, meeting with public officials and community groups, financial planning and financial development.

Differences between SWAP and treatment graduates are also found when one considers the single major activity performed. The single major activity engaged in by 79 percent of the treatment graduates was either direct services to individuals (61 percent) or supervision (18 percent). The single major activity of SWAP graduates was more widely

TABLE 4

MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF POST-1970 GRADUATES
BY SPECIALIZATION*

ACTIVITY	SPECIALIZATION	
	Treatment	SWAP
Direct service to individual clients	77	41
Direct service to groups of unrelated clients	39	14
Direct service to clients meeting in family groups	46	16
Acting as client advocate	52	28
Staff development and training	43	55
Supervising other staff members	49	59
Offering consultation to staff members	61	63
Attending staff meetings	75	73
Budgeting/financial planning	16	34
Writing proposals for funding	10	27
Fund raising	4	11
Planning and carrying out research	8	11
Writing (reports, papers, articles, etc.)	48	56
Helping to develop new programs	41	51
Offering consultation to other agencies	39	42
Meeting with representatives of community agencies	51	56
Organizing community groups	10	14
Meeting with community groups	31	48
Meeting with public officials	15	34
Teaching	25	22
Direct service to caregivers	22	14
Other	6	13

*Percentage of respondents in each category shown.

spread over a range of categories. With the exception of direct services to individual clients and supervision of staff, both of which were mentioned by 24 percent of the SWAP group, no activity was listed as the single major activity by more than eight percent of the respondents.

Assessment of Work Performance

UTSSW alumni evaluated themselves highly in terms of job performance. Table 5 illustrates how graduates rated themselves using the typical or average MSSW with a corresponding level of experience as a base of comparison.

As can be seen in Table 5, a majority of the graduates rated themselves higher than average in each of the 17 areas of performance. Highest ratings are reflected in reliability, productivity, effectiveness of performance, working with staff, and relating to different types of people. Lowest ratings are reflected in knowledge of theory, skill as supervisor and/or consultant, skill in use of supervision and/or consultation, skill in applying theory to practice, and skill in goal attainment.

When looking at the basic, problem-solving skills involved in achieving service objectives, fewer respondents rated themselves higher than average at each step of the problem-solving process. Seventy-six percent of the respondents rated themselves higher than average in problem assessment. The figures dropped to 69 percent in using resources and to 65 percent in goal attainment. Most respondents rated their overall effectiveness of performance (82 percent) and productivity (80 percent), higher than any of the problem-solving skills. These are two areas of performance that might be expected to include problem assessment, resource use and goal attainment. This same pattern is

TABLE 5

ASSESSMENT OF WORK PERFORMANCE USING TYPICAL MSSW AS BASE OF COMPARISON

AREAS OF PERFORMANCE	ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE* Below Average	Average	Above Average	Out-standing
Knowledge of theory	3	41	48	8
Skill in applying theory to practice	1	33	52	14
Skill in use of supervision/ consultation	2	34	49	15
Skill in functioning as supervisor/consultant	3	36	47	15
Skill in realistically assessing changes needed in agency	2	28	53	18
Skill in realistically assessing own strengths and area needing strengthening	1	29	53	16
Skill in problem assessment	1	24	56	20
Skill in goal attainment	2	33	51	14
Skill in using resources	2	25	43	26
Enthusiasm displayed for job	3	27	42	29
Reliability in meeting administrative require-ments of job	2	17	45	37
Overall effectiveness of performance	1	17	63	19
Skill in working with other staff members	1	19	55	26
Skill in relating to different types of people	1	16	56	27
Productivity	1	20	57	23
Skill in adapting to new situations	1	27	55	17
Openness to change, new ideas	1	23	57	19

*Percentage of respondents in each category shown.

found when only treatment graduates are considered: 80 percent rated themselves above average in problem assessment, 71 percent in resource use and 67 percent in goal attainment. SWAP graduates rated themselves about the same in terms of both problem assessment and resource use, 76 and 77 percent respectively, but dropped their rating for goal attainment (66 percent).

Treatment graduates rated themselves higher than SWAP graduates in knowledge of theory, skill in applying theory and skill in relating to others. SWAP graduates rated themselves higher than treatment graduates in openness to change, use of supervision, skill as supervisor/consultant and skill in assessing needed changes. The major areas in which SWAP and treatment graduates differed are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

ASSESSMENT OF WORK PERFORMANCE BY SPECIALIZATION

ACTIVITY	SPECIALIZATION* Treatment	SWAP
Knowledge of theory	54	44
Skill in applying theory	66	52
Use of supervision	58	65
Skill as a supervisor/consultant	55	68
Skill in assessing needed change	68	79
Skill in relating to others	87	77

*Percentage of persons who rated themselves higher than the average social worker appears in each category.

As might be expected given the high ratings of performance, graduates were, for the most part, satisfied with their jobs. Thirty-one percent were very satisfied, 29 percent were quite satisfied and 19 percent were somewhat satisfied. Six percent were not very satisfied and two percent were not at all satisfied. The difference between SWAP and treatment graduates were slight. Fifty-nine percent of the treatment graduates were quite or very satisfied with their jobs and 10 percent were not very or not at all satisfied. The percentages for SWAP graduates were 54 percent and 14 percent respectively.

Assessment of the Educational Program

Several questions were used to obtain graduates' opinions about the University of Tennessee School of Social Work educational program. First, graduates rated several groups of courses according to the degree of helpfulness to them. A scale of 1 to 5, with 1 denoting low helpfulness and 5 high helpfulness, was used. Second, respondents listed the courses which had been most helpful and least helpful to them. Finally, they gave an opinion of the program in general.

Table 7 displays the percentage of the total group who rated each group of courses as high, average, or low in terms of degree of helpfulness. Because respondents were asked not to rate courses which they had not taken, the percentage of nonrespondents is included as well. Table 8 displays the percentages of alumni who took courses in a particular group that fell in each category of helpfulness.

Table 7 shows that 80 percent or more of the total group rated field practice, classes in general and treatment courses as highly helpful or helpful. About a third of the total group rated core research (36 percent) and community organization (32 percent) as not helpful.

TABLE 7

RATING OF GROUPS OF COURSES ACCORDING TO HELPFULNESS

COURSE	DEGREE OF HELPFULNESS* High Helpfulness (5-4 rating)	Average Helpfulness (3 rating)	Low Helpfulness (1-2 rating)	Nonrespondents
Field Practice	77	14	6	3
Classes in general	[illegible]	35	7	5
Core practice	20	18	12	51
Treatment	64	19	7	10
Groups	30	29	20	21
Core Research	12	26	36	26
Core Administration and Planning	24	21	23	33
Administration and Planning (General)	30	20	20	30
Management	17	11	15	57
Community Organization	17	22	32	29
Advanced Policy	11	10	11	69
Research in general	17	29	33	21

*Number in each category is the percentage of total sample giving this response.

TABLE 8

RATING OF GROUPS OF COURSES ACCORDING TO HELPFULNESS

COURSE	DEGREE OF HELPFULNESS* High Helpfulness (5-4 rating)	Average Helpfulness (3 rating)	Low Helpfulness (1-2 rating)
Field Practice	79	14	6
Classes in general	56	37	7
Core practice	41	37	23
Treatment	71	21	8
Groups	37	36	26
Core Research	17	35	48
Core Administration and Planning	35	31	34
Administration and Planning (General)	42	29	29
Management	39	26	34
Community Organization	24	30	45
Advanced Policy	43	31	35
Research in general	22	36	42

*Number in each category is percentage of respondents who took the course giving this rating.

When only the responses of those who rated each course are considered (Table 8), half or more rated each course as helpful or highly helpful. Courses which the majority of respondents rated as highly helpful were field practice, treatment and courses in general. Core research and community organization again emerge as the courses mentioned most frequently (48 percent and 45 percent of the respondents, respectively) as being of low helpfulness.

In response to the question about the two courses which were most helpful, a range of courses was listed. The most frequently mentioned courses, with the percentages listing that course as one of the two most helpful, were as follows: core practice--51 percent, treatment--43 percent, field practice--15 percent, groups--14 percent, core administration and planning--13 percent, and administration and planning (general)--7 percent.

The reasons given for the courses being most helpful were varied as well. Sixty-three percent of the respondents indicated, for at least one of the courses, that the reason was the knowledge gained; 46 percent indicated skills learned; 48 percent said the personal effectiveness of the instructor; and 67 percent said material was relevant to the practice world.

The courses most frequently listed as the least helpful were core research, core administration and planning, and core practice. When graduates were asked to list the two courses which had been least helpful to them, these three courses were listed by 61 percent, 31 percent and 26 percent of the graduates, respectively.

Reasons that graduates found courses to be least helpful varied. Twenty-six percent of the sample indicated that one of the two courses they listed was irrelevant; 30 percent cited no professional interest; 33

percent stated that they had had a poor instructor; and 13 percent gave other reasons.

When only the responses of those who graduated after 1970 are considered, some differences in course assessments are found. Table 9 reports the findings for persons who graduated after 1970. Only the responses of those who took the courses are considered.

TABLE 9

RATING OF GROUPS OF COURSES ACCORDING TO HELPFULNESS FOR POST-1970 GRADUATES

COURSE	DEGREE OF HELPFULNESS*		
	High Helpfulness (5-4 rating)	Average Helpfulness (3 rating)	Low Helpfulness (1-2 rating)
Field Practice	76	16	8
Classes in general	43	47	10
Core practice	35	35	30
Treatment	67	28	10
Groups	44	32	24
Core Research	17	34	50
Core Administration and Planning	41	27	32
Administration and Planning (General)	53	22	25
Management	48	23	28
Community Organization	19	31	50
Advanced Policy	37	32	31
Research in general	26	36	38

*Number in each category is percentage of respondents taking the course giving this rating.

As Table 9 shows, research and community organization each were still listed most frequently (50 percent of respondents) as being of low helpfulness. Field practice and treatment courses were rated by over half of the respondents in the high helpfulness category. General administration and planning courses replaced classes in general as the third course rated by over half of the respondents as being of high helpfulness.

The rating of courses according to degree of helpfulness shows marked differences between SWAP and treatment graduates. Table 10 shows the rating of courses according to degree of helpfulness by specialization.

TABLE 10

HIGH HELPFULNESS RATING OF COURSES BY SPECIALIZATION*

COURSE	SPECIALIZATION	
	Treatment	SWAP
Field Practice	80	66
Classes in General	38	50
Core Practice	31	41
Treatment	68	46
Groups	45	42
Core Research	12	25
Core Administration and Planning	22	66
Administration and Planning (General)	27	80
Management	20	67
Community Organization	11	31
Advanced Policy	12	54
Research (General)	20	35

*Number in each category is percentage of respondents from each specialization who rated the course as being of high helpfulness (4-5 rating).

Table 10 shows that SWAP graduates rated most of the groups of courses higher than did treatment graduates. The notable exceptions were field practice and treatment courses. Four-fifths of the treatment graduates rated field practice highly as compared with two-thirds of the SWAP graduates. Differences in the most helpful and least helpful courses were also found for treatment graduates and SWAP graduates.

Treatment graduates ranked individual and family treatment courses (41 percent), core practice (36 percent), group treatment (17 percent) and other treatment theory courses (15 percent) as most helpful. There was less agreement among SWAP graduates regarding the most helpful course. Twenty-nine percent ranked core practice, 22 percent--management courses, 19 percent--core administration and planning, and 16 percent--general administration and planning courses as most helpful.

The least helpful courses for treatment graduates were research (36 percent), core administration and planning (26 percent), and core practice (18 percent). The least helpful course for the greatest number of SWAP graduates was core practice (38 percent), followed by research (29 percent) and community organization (11 percent).

Fewer than one-fourth of the respondents listed any single type of course as one that would have been helpful had they taken it. When courses were mentioned, treatment graduates tended to emphasize treatment courses, while SWAP graduates tended to emphasize SWAP courses. For example, 22 percent of the treatment graduates thought that other courses in the treatment area, and 17 percent thought that other treatment methods courses would have been helpful. Twenty percent and 15 percent of the SWAP graduates felt that courses in the administration area and management courses respectively would have been helpful.

In general, graduates were satisfied with the UTSSW educational program. Twenty-four percent stated they were very satisfied; 42 percent said they were quite satisfied and 26 percent said they were somewhat satisfied. Seven percent were not very satisfied and one percent was not at all satisfied.

Satisfaction levels for persons who graduated after 1970 were somewhat lower, with treatment graduates generally less satisfied than SWAP graduates. Among those who graduated after 1970, 16 percent were very satisfied, 39 percent quite satisfied, 33 percent somewhat satisfied, 11 percent not very satisfied and one percent not at all satisfied. Fifty percent of the treatment students were very or quite satisfied in contrast to 61 percent of the SWAP graduates.

UTSSW Alumni Services

Over half (57 percent) of the respondents indicated that they wanted alumni services from University of Tennessee School of Social Work. A range of services was desired: 14 percent requested job placement service, 43 percent--workshops, 27 percent--summer institutes, 17 percent--social work management certification and 8 percent--other services. Thirty-nine percent expressed interest in a UTSSW doctoral program and 25 percent expressed interest in one or more continuing education courses.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The major findings of the survey are summarized below.

1. The majority of UTSSW graduates resided in Tennessee and the Southeast prior to entering the UTSSW program and practiced there once they graduated. At the time of the survey, most worked in agencies which were under public or combined public/private auspices and in urban or small city areas.

2. UTSSW graduates, at the time of the survey, were primarily involved in casework and administration. Fewer than four percent utilized research, community organization, and policy analysis combined as a major method. While most graduates were practicing the method for which they received formal education, a significant number of graduates were practicing out of method. Of the post-1970 graduates, one-fifth of those who were trained in treatment utilized administration as the major method of practice, and one-fourth of those who were trained in administration and planning utilized casework as the major method.

3. The major activities engaged in by over three-fourths of the treatment graduates were casework and supervision. The major activities for SWAP graduates were more varied, however, and except for casework and supervision, no single activity was listed by more than eight percent of the SWAP graduates.

4. Treatment graduates tended to rate treatment courses as most helpful, while SWAP graduates rated both treatment and SWAP courses as most helpful. The core research courses were generally viewed as the least helpful courses, although the SWAP graduates viewed them more positively than treatment graduates.

5. UTSSW alumni assessed their work performance highly and, in general, were satisfied with their jobs. Highest ratings were given for reliability, productivity, effectiveness of performance, working with staff and relating to different types of people. Lowest ratings were reflected in knowledge of theory, skill as supervisor and/or consultant, skill in use of supervision and/or consultation, skill in applying theory to practice, and skill in goal attainment.

6. The field component of social work was generally viewed in a positive manner by UTSSW alumni. Treatment graduates, however, assessed the field component more favorably than did SWAP graduates.

7. A little more than half of the graduates desired further service from UTSSW. Formal educational opportunities, both short-term and long-term, were the services mentioned most frequently.

As indicated previously, the survey findings reported here are tentative. The sample was not randomly selected and the response rate was modest; nevertheless, the patterns which emerged from the data provide the basis for further exploration in key areas. Furthermore,

many of the findings are not unique to this study. For example, the low priority that social workers give to research is a common finding and focus of discussion in the social work education literature (Rosenblat, 1968; Kirk, Osmalov and Fischer, 1976; Casselman, 1972). Both the varied nature of the activities and tasks that SWAP graduates undertake in human service agencies and the large numbers of graduates practicing out of method have been noted in social work manpower research (Patti, 1977; Radin, 1974).

In some instances the summary findings are revealing. In many, however, further analysis by subgroups--e.g., branches, specialization, year of graduation, sex--along with interpretation should lead to a broader understanding of the issues involved. Some of the major findings, as they relate to improvement of the UTSSW educational program, are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The low status of research, in general, warrants attention. Although further analysis of the data may point out differences among different subgroups, the large percentage of graduates who perceived the core research courses as being of little help to them indicates this is a problem area. One area of inquiry is the reasons why courses were perceived as being of little help. A second involves implications of the low research status.

The data show that few graduates were engaged in research activities. Since few were directly involved in developing and conducting research studies, one might reason that when compared with courses which are directly related to major work activities--e.g., individual therapy, supervision, financial planning, etc.--research courses would be considered less helpful.

The perception by almost half of the respondents that core research courses were of little help when each course was rated individually suggests, however, a deeper problem. It appears that many of the respondents did not use what was taught in the research courses in their work.

The possible reasons why research is not used are varied. Perhaps the core research courses do not cover material that could be used in social work practice; perhaps more in-depth coverage of the material is needed before it can be applied. A nonresearch orientation may prevail among many of the graduates and the scientific method may not be viewed as useful or needed in social work. Perhaps research findings and research strategies and techniques are not integrated in other courses, thereby suggesting that a course in research methodology has little to do with practice realities and development of the profession.

Examination of the possible reasons for the findings, along with an analysis of the status of research among subgroups, should be helpful in improving the MSSW program.

Although it did not receive overall low ratings, supervision of staff is an area that needs strengthening. Supervision of other staff was one of the major activities of the respondents; yet, when compared with other activities, it was one of the areas in which a substantial number of graduates felt least competent. The data indicate that the majority of the graduates are not closely supervised after receiving the MSSW degree. While they appear to be able to perform their jobs effectively without close supervision, they may not have received adequate exposure to the fundamentals of giving and receiving supervision. This could then lead to feelings of not being as adequate in this area

as in others. The educational program might explore ways of strengthening the supervision component in both field and course work.

Findings in reference to the core practice course are puzzling. Core practice was mentioned as one of the two most helpful courses by 51 percent of the respondents and, at the same time, as the least helpful course by 26 percent. As with the core research courses, analysis of the data by subgroups may lead to greater understanding of the reasons behind these conflicting views. Different groups of persons (e.g., experienced versus nonexperienced) may enter the program with different levels of knowledge and thus have different needs in terms of beginning course content. Other groups (e.g., those who become administrators versus those who become caseworkers) may have different needs once they leave the program. If one of the latter groups views the practice courses as helpful and the other views it in the opposite manner, perhaps the course content is not core or fundamental to all social work practice but to one particular methodology or type of social work. A reconceptualization of the core course may be in order.

The low involvement of UTSSW alumni in research, in policy formulation and analysis, and in community organization carries implications for social work in the Southeast. If these activities are not being carried out by other disciplines or by graduates of other social work programs, then certain needed tasks are either not being done or are being done haphazardly. Included are the systematic evaluation of programs and practices, the meaningful assessment of various social problems, the development of programs which meet the needs of different subgroups of the population, the ongoing monitoring of programs to promote effectiveness and efficiency, and the examination of causal

factors. The role of the School may be to assist in creating a job market in these areas, prepare persons for current and future jobs in these areas, or even to assess the extent to which jobs in these areas are wanted or needed.

The different work activities engaged in by the graduates supports the School's current efforts in preparing persons for clinical positions and administration and planning positions. The large number of graduates who were practicing out of method, however, raises some issues for exploration. Questions which carry implications for curriculum development at UTSSW include the following. Why do persons trained for micro-level practice engage in macro-level practice as a major work activity and vice versa? Do graduates practicing a method for which they received no formal, specialized training perform their jobs as well as those who received specialized training? Do persons practicing out of method have training needs which could be met either through a different curriculum mix in the master's program or through special continuing education offerings? An exploration of these areas, while needed, was beyond the scope of this general survey.

In conclusion, this report presents a descriptive picture of UTSSW graduates and provides a starting point for identifying strengths and weaknesses of the educational program. It is hoped that further analysis and informed interpretations of the findings explicated here will lead to a broader understanding of key issues and subsequently result in improvements in the UTSSW educational program.

REFERENCES

Casselman, Betsey-lee. "On the Practitioner's Orientation Toward Research." Smith College Studies in Social Work, 42 (June 1972), 211-215.

Kirk, Stuart A., Michael J. Osmalov, and Joel Fischer. "Social Workers' Involvement in Research." Social Work, 21 (March 1976).

Patti, Rino J. "Patterns of Management Activity in Social Welfare Agencies." Administration in Social Work, (Spring 1977), 5-18.

Radin, Norma. "A Follow-Up Study of Social Work Graduates: Implications for Social Work Education" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, Georgia, (March 1974).

Rosenblatt, Rosen. "The Practitioner's Use and Evaluation of Research." Social Work, 13 (January 1968), 53-59.

The UTSSW Accreditation Progress Report (1973-1976, Vol. 1), submitted to the Council on Social Work Education, March 1976.

III. PROFILE OF 20 UTSSW BLACK ALUMNI

by Art Knighton

This profile is based on the 1978 Alumni Survey responses of 20 black alumni of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work (UTSSW). The profile is not conclusive and does not speak for all black social work alumni. However, it is a start in the right direction in providing an empirical data base for future social work educational planning and manpower development.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A survey of recent literature was unsuccessful in locating any material on blacks and other minorities who have graduated from professional schools of social work in relation to their social, economic and political progress.

In 1972, during a national conference of black social workers, a sociologist from Howard University reported, "Over 70 percent of all black PhD's, MD's, JD's, and judges have received their undergraduate degrees from predominately black colleges and universities." It was this kind of research finding that prompted black and white leaders in the political, economic and social areas to push for more federal funds and resources for black colleges and universities.

Because data and informational resources are limited, this study is more timely. In this context, two major research questions are raised.

1. Does the MSSW Guarantee the "Good Life" for Black Social Workers?

Black students and their parents need to know the MSSW's benefits in terms of guaranteeing the "good life" in American society, such as better earnings, more purchasing power, the suburban house with a two-car garage and "white picket fence," job satisfaction, and place of employment (low-income, black communties, urban or rural areas).

These measures are indicators of economic participation in the midstream of American life and are important to blacks, because they have been denied the "good life" for a long time.

2. What Kind of Black Person is Attracted to the Social Work Profession?

In 1974, at the Council on Social Work Education Conference in Atlanta, Georgia, former Ambassador to the U.N. Andrew Young said, "Most social workers have a little bit of preacher in them." The packed auditorium roared. However, that remark stayed with some, because during the old days, before the 1954 Supreme Court decision and the OEO Act of 1964, many blacks were channeled into preaching, teaching, and the undertaking professions. More light needs to be shed on whether or not this type of career channeling is happening in the social work profession. Further exploration should deal with how and why they enter the social work profession, as well as areas of specializations they select.

At first glance, the data and information needed for answering these questions may seem trivial. However, if we are going to advance the frontiers of graduate social work education and manpower development for blacks, universities, major funding sources and the market place must have this kind of empirical data to serve as a planning framework.

METHOD

During 1978, questionnaires were mailed to 1,450 UTSSW alumni whose names were on a mailing list maintained by the Office of Continuing Social Work Education. The questionnaire requested information about their demographic characteristics, current job settings and yearly

salaries, UTSSW educational training experiences and job preparation, and the need for future social work programs and services.*

Four-hundred eight-five questionnaires were completed and returned, representing a 34 percent rate of return. Twenty of the respondents were black and the data for this profile were taken from their responses. Because of the small sample size, the findings are reported in both numbers and percentages.

Because of this small number of black respondents, the results of this profile should be interpreted with caution, and precise conclusions and generalizations should be avoided. However, informational insight, hunches, and "gut" feelings can be aroused and they can provide a conceptual framework for future research efforts. The profile findings are organized according to the following four areas: (1) demographic characteristics, (2) UTSSW educational training and curriculum areas, (3) employment and job setting, and (4) the need for future UTSSW programs and services.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of UTSSW Black Alumni

UTSSW black alumni who responded to the survey can be characterized demographically in the following way:

- 18 or 90% are females.
- 2 or 10% are males.

---

*Author's Note: The design of the survey questionnaire and the first computation of the data was conducted by Dr. Robert C. Holloway, a member of the faculty at UTSSW-Nashville, now on the faculty of the School of Social Work in Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

- 15 or 75% are 24-30 years old.
- 19 or 95% entered UTSSW via the regular two-year program.
- 12 or 60% entered with 2-4 years of prior social work experience.
- 11 or 55% received the MSSW between 1972-1975 from the Nashville Branch.
- 11 or 55% were members of NABSW.
- 9 or 45% were members of NASW.
- All were employed and living in the state of Tennessee at the time of the survey, 1978.

The typical UTSSW black alumnus is female and young (24-30 years old), entered the regular two-year social work program with two to four years of previous social work experience, and is employed full-time. Over half (55 percent) entered UTSSW during the mid- and late 1960's. One respondent received the MSSW during the late 1950's.

Educational Experiences

Black alumni were asked, "In general, how satisfied are you with your UTSSW educational experience as preparation for your post-MSSW career?" Response categories ranged from 1--very satisfied to 5--not at all satisfied. Over one-half (12 or 60 percent) reported that they were quite satisfied; six or 30 percent responded somewhat satisfied; and none reported that they were not satisfied. Two or 10 percent did not respond to this item.

The profile suggests that most black alumni were satisfied with their UTSSW educational experience. However, no questions were asked about their social and integrative experiences, such as social interaction with other students (whites); participation in school activities, commit-

tees; classroom instructions and the perspectives in which the courses were taught, such as the inclusion of minority content; and how well they integrated into the larger environment (city) in which the branches are located (Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville). More light needs to be shed on these questions because UTSSW still carries the image of the "big, white, Southern university."

Social Work Specialization

To the question, "In which method did you specialize at the School of Social Work?", possible responses were social work treatment (casework or group work), administration and planning (includes community organization), or dual specialization (a combined treatment-administration program).

The largest number of black alumni (18 or 90 percent) specialized in social work treatment. Only two (10 percent) specialized in administration and planning. This profile suggests that blacks tend to avoid administration, management, supervision, planning and policy research. These positions carry responsibilities of leadership and decision making, and usually a higher salary than treatment positions.

The data do not provide information as to why such a small percentage of blacks select administration and planning. Possible reasons could include inadequate professional social work information, role models or instructors' influence [At a recent undergraduate program, several students stated, "I am going into social treatment because my instructor told me that is where the action is."], greater availability of social treatment jobs or simply a matter of personal choice. Black alumni could have in fact preferred to be social treatment persons. However, 10 (50 percent) reported they were not satisfied with their current job.

Another survey item asked alumni to evaluate curriculum areas and courses in terms of helpfulness. Possible ratings ranged from 5 to 1, with 5 denoting high helpfulness and 1 low helpfulness. Respondents circled N/A (not applicable) if they did not take courses in certain areas. The results are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

RATINGS OF COURSE HELPFULNESS

COURSES	High 5-4	Average 3	Low 1-2	N/A	Total
Field Practice	18 (90)	2 (10)			20
Social Work Treatment	9 (45)	5 (25)	6 (30)		20
Administration and Planning	3 (15)	6 (30)	5 (25)	6 (30)	14
Management	2 (10)	4 (20)	8 (40)	6 (30)	14
Community Organization	2 (10)	4 (20)		16 (70)	6
Advanced Policy	1 (5)	2 (10)		17 (85)	3
Research	4 (20)	8 (40)	8 (40)		20
					N = 20

*Numbers in parentheses refer to percentages of responses.

As can be seen in Table 1, nearly all respondents (18 or 90 percent) rated field practice courses as being of high helpfulness, and almost one-half (45 percent) rated social work treatment courses as being of high helpfulness. This comparison tends to indicate a prefer-

ence toward field practice courses. Could it be that field practice courses are more reality-based, less theoretical, or deal with "what's happening now"? The majority had taken no courses in community organization or advanced policy. The researcher does not have sufficient data to explore possible answers to these questions.

Agency and Community Settings of Current Jobs

Alumni were asked, "What is the setting in which you are currently employed?" Response categories included the following: (1) alcohol, drugs; (2) family and child welfare; (3) community health and mental health; (4) poverty programs; (5) vocational rehabilitation; (6) corrections; (7) council planning. Following are the results.

TABLE 2

AGENCY SETTINGS FOR CURRENT JOBS

CURRENT JOB SETTING	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
Health & Community Mental Health	6	30
Child Welfare & Family Services	3	15
Services for the Aged	3	15
School Social Work	3	15
Teaching, University & College	2	10
No Response	3	15
TOTAL	20	100

All respondents reported that they were employed full-time in a social work setting. Six (30 percent) were employed in health and community mental health settings; nine (45 percent) in child welfare,

services for the aged, and school social work; and two (10 percent) were teaching at the college and university level. Three (15 percent) did not respond. None reported being employed in settings such as council planning, courts or corrections, community action, vocational rehabilitation or minority group organizations. Future curriculum and manpower should emphasize a focus designed to attract blacks to these areas.

The nature of the data collected does not permit exploration of why blacks go into health and not other areas. Job market trends indicate more job opportunities in the health-care field and settings, and fewer opportunities in community action programs and minority group organizations, a reflection of our present national budget and resource focus.

To the question, "In what type of community is your social work job located: (1) urban low income, (2) urban non-low income, (3) suburban areas, (4) small city, (5) semi-rural area, and (6) rural area," alumni provided the responses shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

COMMUNITY SETTINGS FOR CURRENT JOBS

COMMUNITY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Urban low income	13	65
Urban non-low income	2	10
Small city	3	15
Semi-rural area	2	10
TOTAL	20	100

Over one-half (13 or 65 percent) were working in low-income, urban communities. None reported employment in suburban communities. National professional manpower indicators reveal a shortage of professional expertise in low-income, urban communities in the areas of health and law. It appears that UTSSW black alumni respondents are making inroads to correct this shortage.

Social Work Methods Most Often Used in Current Job

Alumni responded to the question, "Which social work method(s) do you use most often in your current job? Check as many as are appropriate: (1) case work, (2) group work, (3) family therapy, (4) community practice, (5) administration, (6) policy formulation and analysis, (7) research." Eighteen (90 percent) said they utilized either casework or group work in their current jobs; two (10 percent) used administration and planning. None reported using family therapy, community practice, policy formulation and analysis, or research. The methods in which they were trained in were the ones used most often in their current jobs.

Self-evaluation of Current Job Performance

Respondents rated their current job performance using a typical or average MSSW with a corresponding level of experience as a base of comparison. Possible ratings were below average, average, above average and outstanding. The results in several key areas are presented in Table 4 on the following page.

In the areas of using community resources and volunteers and working with other people, most alumni rated their current job performance as outstanding (7 or 35 percent) or above average (9 or 45 per-

TABLE 4

RATINGS OF JOB PERFORMANCE

SKILLS AREAS	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Outstanding	Total
Knowledge of integrating theory and practice	2 (10)	8 (40)	8 (40)	2 (10)	20
Functioning as a supervisor	2 (10)	6 (30)	7 (35)	5 (25)	20
Problem assessment	2 (10)	5 (25)	8 (40)	5 (25)	20
Working and relating to people	2 (10)	3 (15)	9 (45)	6 (30)	20
Using resources, agencies, colleagues, volunteers	2 (10)	2 (10)	9 (45)	7 (35)	20

Numbers in parentheses refer to percentage of responses. N=20

cent). Knowledge of integrating theory and practice received a low outstanding rating (two or 10 percent) with most respondents rating themselves as average or above average in this area.

The profile suggests that alumni think they are performing outstandingly or above average in all areas. However, no cross-check was built into the survey to prove this to be the case. Cross-checks could come from their supervisors, peers, or overall job performance ratings.

Alumni were asked how satisfied they were with their current jobs. Ten persons (50 percent) reported they were not satisfied with their current jobs, while eight (40 percent) reported they were. Two (10 percent) did not respond to this question. Further research efforts could determine why so few were satisfied and how this compares with other professions such as law, medicine, and business.

Current Yearly Salary Range

The following table illustrates responses to the question, "What is your current yearly salary (at full-time rate)?"

TABLE 5

ANNUAL SALARIES

CURRENT YEARLY SALARY RANGE	NUMBER	PERCENT
$10,000 - $11,999	2	10
$12,000 - $13,999	5	25
$18,000 - $19,999	1	5
$20,000 - $24,000	2	10
No Response	10	50
TOTAL	20	100

As can be seen in the table, the average salary ranged between $12,000 and $14,000 yearly. Only three (30 percent) of those persons who reported salaries earned over $14,000. This is a dramatic contrast to the $16,000-and-over salary level reported by 50 percent of all survey respondents. This difference might be explained by: social work specialization (most black alumni have specialized in social work treatment, which tends to pay less than social work administration and planning), experience, agency funding source, or the community in which they are employed.

Half or 50 percent did not report their yearly salary. However, all reported they were working full-time in social work.

The Need for Future Graduate Social Work Programs and Services at UTSSW

Fifteen (75 percent) of black alumni expressed an interest in future services and programs. The types of requests which they made are illustrated in Table 6.

TABLE 6

REQUESTS FOR ALUMNI SERVICES

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Workshops	11	55
Summer Institute	7	35
Clinical Practice	6	30
Social Work Management	6	30

As Table 6 shows, the largest number of respondents 11 (55 percent) expressed interest in workshops. Approximately one-third wanted further training in clinical skills and one-third desired management training.

SUMMARY

As stated at the outset, the results of this profile should be interpreted with caution. Precise conclusions and generalizations should be avoided because of the small number of respondents. However, the profile shows that:

1. Nearly all (18 or 90 percent) of the black alumni respondents were females.

2. Field practice courses are felt to be the most helpful courses taken.

3. Nearly all (18 or 90 percent) of the black alumni selected the social work treatment specialization.

4. Nearly all (18 or 90 percent) said they were satisfied with their UTSSW educational experience as preparation for a post-MSSW career.

5. Three-fourths (15 or 75 percent) were working in health, community mental health, child welfare and family services, services for the aged and school social work at the time of the survey.

6. None reported working in council planning, the courts and corrections, community action agencies, vocational rehabilitation services or minority group organizations.

7. Over half (13 or 65 percent) were working in low-income, urban areas.

8. Half reported dissatisfaction with their current jobs.

9. The average yearly earnings were between $12,000 and $14,000, which was less than salaries reported by all UTSSW alumni.

10. Over half expressed an interest in future UTSSW services through workshops and summer institutes.

Future Study Implications

Future study efforts should consist of a sub-sample of UTSSW black and other minority alumni to examine the following questions:

1. Why was there such a low percentage of black alumni responses?

2. Why were so few black alumni trained in the social work administration and planning specialization?

3. Why was there such a high percentage of female and low percentage of male, black alumni respondents?

4. Why were no black alumni respondents working in social welfare administration and planning areas, such as council planning, courts and corrections, community action agencies, or minority group organizations?

5. Why was the average salary range for black alumni respondents lower than the overall alumni respondents' salary range?

6. Why did over half report dissatisfaction with their current jobs?

7. Where did black alumni receive their undergraduate education and training (black or white universities? north or south?)?

8. Are black alumni any better off than their parents in terms of upward social mobility and earning power?

More information could provide UTSSW administration, faculty, students and parents with answers to the questions posed at the beginning of this paper: Does the MSSW guarantee the "good life" for black social workers? What kind of black person is attracted to the social work profession at UTSSW?

There are some changing trends occurring at UTSSW regarding blacks. More blacks are entering UTSSW today than 10 or 15 years ago, and more are specializing in the social work administration and planning specialization. A five- or ten-year "revisit" survey could substantiate these trends.

IV. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AND SALARIES OF FEMALE GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Claire F. Lowry

Changing roles of women in American society are creating repercussions in the social work profession as well as in other institutions. It has often been pointed out that although women in social work outnumber men, men tend to rise to higher positions of authority and earn higher salaries than women (Belon, 1977; Chafetz, 1972; Herberg, 1973; Knapman, 1977; Ozawa, 1976; Scotch, 1971; Stamm, 1969; Williams, 1974). Many explanations for this divergence have been suggested: societal expectations for men to take command; sex discrimination in hiring, promotion and pay policies; the training of women for nurturing, direct service roles; societal expectations for women to carry heavier family responsibility than men and the subsequent withdrawal of women with children from the work force.

When the University of Tennessee School of Social Work surveyed its alumni in 1978, an opportunity was presented to determine if the gaps between male and female employment patterns, administrative responsibility and salaries that were noted in previous studies were apparent among Tennessee alumni. There was also an opportunity to compare female graduates and search for trends in women's employment patterns. This Alumni Survey also offered access to information about the employment status and success of a relatively new group of graduates, "re-entry women," defined as older students who have entered or re-entered the work force after spending several years as homemakers.

METHOD

The University of Tennessee School of Social Work Alumni Survey was modeled after a similar study conducted by the University of Michigan in 1972. The Survey contained questions about current and past

employment, salary and geographical location of alumni. It contained inquiries about job satisfaction, opinion of professional training and interest in continuing education. The Tennessee questionnaire included additional demographic data such as sex, age and marital status.

In June 1978, the survey was mailed to 1,450 persons listed by the Office of Continuing Social Work Education as graduates of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work. From these, 485 completed questionnaires were returned, a return rate of 34 percent. Since descriptive information about those on the mailing list was not available, it was not possible to infer that the sample was representative of all alumni. This study is limited, therefore, to discussion of the 485 alumni responses.

Subjects in the Alumni Survey

The sample included alumni who received their MSSW as early as 1940 and as late as 1978. One-half (50 percent) graduated during the seventies. Most (94 percent) of the respondents were listed as white. Women (64 percent) outnumbered men (36 percent), and more than half (59 percent) received the MSSW degree before the age of 30. Most (85 percent) respondents were then employed as social workers and almost all (98 percent) had held social work positions at some time since receiving the MSSW. Approximately one-half (50 percent) of the respondents earned $16,000 or more, and over one-fourth (27 percent) earned $20,000 or more per year.

RESULTS

Employment Status of Alumni

As Table 1 demonstrates, employment patterns of female alumni

TABLE 1

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ALUMNI BY SEX, AGE AND MARITAL STATUS

GROUP	Current Employment Status											
	% Full-Time Social Work		% Part-Time Social Work		% Not Working by Choice		% Looking for Work		% Working but not Social Worker		% Other	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
All Alumni	91	73	1	9	1	9	--	2	6	2	1	5
Age												
Under 30	100	87	--	4	--	5	--	--	--	2	--	2
30-39	93	77	--	12	1	6	--	2	5	2	1	1
40-49	91	74	--	12	--	7	--	2	7	2	2	3
50-59	71	76	--	5	--	12	--	3	29	2	--	2
60 and over	75	38	--	12	--	19	--	--	25	--	--	31
Marital Status												
Married	92	66	1	13	1	12	--	3	6	3	--	2
Single	86	86	--	1	--	3	--	--	14	1	--	9
Div./Sep.	66	89	--	7	--	--	--	--	17	--	17	4
Widowed	--	46	--	8	--	31	--	--	--	--	--	15
Re-entry Women		86		11		3		--		--		--

differed from those of males. Almost all men reported full-time employment, either in social work (91 percent) or in another field (7 percent). By comparison, only 70 percent of female respondents reported they were full-time social workers. It can be inferred from that data that women are also less likely (2 percent) to be employed in other occupations, much more likely than men to work part-time (9 percent), to choose not to work (9 percent), or to be looking for work (2 percent).

Employment and Marital Status

It is interesting to examine women's employment patterns in relation to their marital status. Of the women who worked part-time, 81 percent were married, 4 percent single, 11 percent divorced or separated, and 4 percent widowed. All alumnae who reported they were looking for work were married.

These figures raise questions which might be fruitful for further study. Why do over three times as many men as women leave social work for other occupations? Does it have to do with more opportunities or with dissatisfaction with social work?

While it might be assumed that married women are less likely to work full-time because of family responsibilities or less need for income, why are they the only group who reported members looking for work? Can married women afford to be more particular about the jobs they take? Are their choices limited by needs and schedules of other family members? Have husbands' job changes placed them in new localities? Are employers reluctant to hire women who might become pregnant or move away? It would be interesting to study the effect of family needs and husbands' careers on wives' employment opportunities.

It is possible that more married alumnae would be active in social work if more part-time positions were available. Only 53 percent of all married female respondents preferred full-time employment.

Age and Employment Status

One of the study's most intriguing findings was that the highest percentages of alumnae who chose not to work were in older age groups--not in the 20's and 30's when women typically are most concerned with child care. Have younger groups of career women postponed child bearing? Are they combining child rearing and careers? The answers to these questions were beyond the scope of this study; however, national statistics on women in the work force may provide definitive answers. Why have so many older women left the work force? Does this indicate a difference in values between older and younger alumnae, or are employment opportunities less attractive to older women?

Alumni Retirement Plans

It was difficult to interpret alumni responses to the question of whether or not they planned to work until retirement. As Table 2 shows, a number of men and women, particularly under 30 years of age, either do not plan to work until retirement or are unsure about their plans. Only 47 percent of women under 30, 57 percent of married women, 67 percent of men under 30, and 67 percent of single men had plans to work until retirement. Does this represent a change in the American work ethic or simply a hasty response to a long questionnaire?

Older groups of alumni are likely to plan to work until retirement. Family responsibilities also seemed to influence responses to this question since married men (89 percent), divorced or separated women (88

TABLE 2

ALUMNI PLANS FOR RETIREMENT BY SEX, AGE AND MARITAL STATUS

	PLANS FOR RETIREMENT					
	% who plan to work until retirement		% who do not plan to work until retirement		% undecided about retirement	
GROUP	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
All Alumni	87	68	4	4	9	28
Age						
Under 30	67	47	11	14	22	39
30-39	85	64	5	3	10	33
40-49	92	73	2	--	6	27
50-59	94	81	--	--	6	19
60 and over	100	93	--	7	--	--
Marital Status						
Married	89	57	4	4	7	39
Single	67	76	--	7	33	17
Div./Sep.	75	88	25	--	--	12
Widowed	--	86	--	--	--	14
Re-entry Women		71		--		29

percent) and widowed women (86 percent) indicated they were most likely to plan to work until retirement.

Though many men responded they do not definitely plan to work until retirement, the percentage of women who indicated they would not is greater in every age group. Over one-half of the alumnae under 30 years of age (56 percent) and over one-third of those in their 30's (36 percent) would consider dropping out of the work force at some future time.

Social Work Method Occupying Most Time

The findings shown on Table 3 correspond to results of other job difference studies between male and female social workers: most women hold direct service positions and most men are administrators. The survey indicated that while most male and female social workers begin their careers in treatment positions, men soon leave these jobs for administrative positions. Women are more likely to enter administrative jobs in their 40's and 50's, while most men make that change in their 30's.

The degree to which these roles are self-selected or imposed by custom or sex discrimination needs to be determined. In the future will more women seek administrative roles as a result of changing values or Affirmative Action laws? Will more men be hired for treatment positions as a result of less rigid sex role attitudes or greater competition for administrative positions? A follow-up study in five or ten years might yield some clues.

Salary

The University of Tennessee Alumni Survey added more evidence to studies which have indicated that male social workers are better paid

TABLE 3

SOCIAL WORK METHOD OCCUPYING MOST TIME
BY SEX AND AGE

	METHODS					
	% Treatment		% Administration and Planning		% Other[a]	
GROUP	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
All Alumni	38	61	56	32	6	7
Age						
Under 30	78	69	22	27	--	4
30-39	36	68	62	28	2	4
40-49	32	54	59	37	9	9
50-59	27	50	60	40	13	10
60 and under	--	63	67	25	33	12
Re-entry Women		68		23		9

[a]Other includes social workers engaged in research, community practice, and other unspecified methods.

than female social workers. The average salary, according to survey results, was $20,516 for all men and $15,947 for all women. As Table 4 indicates, men in every age group averaged higher salaries than their female counterparts. Except for one age group (50-59), the gap between men's and women's salaries grows wider as they get older.

TABLE 4

MEAN SALARIES OF ALUMNI BY AGE AND SEX

	MEAN SALARY ($)	
GROUP	Male	Female
All Alumni	20,516	15,974
Age		
Under 30	14,333	12,918
30-39	19,163	15,873
40-49	23,360	16,614
50-59	22,617	17,817
60 and up	25,833	16,625
Re-entry Women		14,773

NOTE: Means were computed by using the midpoints of salary ranges.

When percentages of male and female social workers in each salary range were examined (see Table 5), it became apparent that a higher percentage of men were in the upper salary ranges and a higher percentage of women were in the lower salary ranges. The discrepancy at the $10,000 to $11,999 range and at the $25,000-and-over range were particularly marked.

It must be remembered that part-time female workers probably depressed the female salaries to some extent.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGES OF ALUMNI IN SALARY RANGES

SALARY RANGE ($)	MALE	FEMALE	RE-ENTRY WOMEN
Under 8,000	1	1	--
8,000-9,999	2	2	3
10,000-11,999	4	14	11
12,000-13,999	16	26	37
14,000-15,999	13	21	20
16,000-17,999	14	14	14
18,000-19,999	13	9	6
20,000-24,999	23	10	9
25,000 and over	15	3	--

A follow-up study of data from the Alumni Survey might show whether or not the gap between male and female social work salaries closes as a result of Affirmative Action laws or changing customs.

RE-ENTRY WOMEN

The entry or return to college of many nontraditional students, especially older women who have been homemakers, is a recent phenomenon welcomed by educators, especially in light of declining student enrollment.

Schools of social work have graduated a number of such women in recent years, although they are not identified as a separate group in statistics of the Council on Social Work Education. The percentage of women over 31 years of age in U.S. schools of social work grew from 18 percent in 1976 to 22 percent in 1978 (Note 1). One assumes that some of these are re-entry women. For example, approximately seven percent of the graduating classes of 1976, 1977 and 1978 from the Memphis Branch of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work can be classified as re-entry women--they are older women with children and have little social work experience or are entering social work for the first time.

There has been little research on the experience of re-entry women in the social work job market. Sales, Shore and Bolitho (Note 2) conducted a study of all women with children who completed their MSSW between 1972 and 1976 at the University of Pittsburgh. The average age of these women was 39 and more than three-fourths of them had worked full-time in human services before they entered graduate school. The study revealed that these women had no difficulty finding jobs soon after graduation and that 80 percent were working full-time. Only three of the sample's 45 women reported they were not interested in employment.

There have been no known research efforts to study re-entry social workers' employment experience over a longer period of time,

although this group of women has probably constituted a steady percentage of graduating students in the last 15 years. Information about this group might be useful to prospective employers or school admission committees.

Information from the Alumni Survey gave some sample evidence of the work experience of re-entry women who graduated from the University of Tennessee School of Social Work. It answered questions about whether or not they remained in the labor force for a period of years after graduation, the kinds of jobs they held and how their salary levels and administrative responsibilities compared with other alumni.

METHOD

For the purposes of the study, re-entry women were defined as female graduates (alumnae) who were mothers, who were married or formerly married, who received the MSSW at or after age 30, and who had less than two years of social work experience before entering graduate school.

The 36 alumnae who met these criteria represented approximately seven percent of the Alumni Survey respondents. It was impossible to speculate whether or not this percentage represented a national or university-wide trend because the Council on Social Work Education has not statistically identified re-entry women. The percentage was, however, consistent with recent information from the Memphis Branch of the School of Social Work.

SUBJECTS

Re-entry respondents ranged from 33 to 67 years of age. Their average age was 48 and when they received the MSSW, their ages

ranged from 30 to 56, with an average of 41. They received the MSSW from 1959 to 1978 and half graduated before 1970, half between 1970 and 1978.

Of the 36 women in the sample, 64 percent had no social work experience prior to graduate school, 17 percent had less than one year of social work experience, and 19 percent had between one and two years of experience. Married women formed 61 percent of the group, 31 percent were divorced or separated, and eight percent were widowed.

RESULTS

Re-entry women (97 percent) were more likely than any other group of alumni to be employed as social workers, either full-time or part-time (see Table 1). Only one individual in the sample, a women over 65 years of age, was not employed.

One might speculate that because their career choices are made at a mature age with major child care responsibilities behind them, re-entry women are more likely to remain in social work than women who marry and have children after their professional training. This confirms the findings of Herberg (1973) who determined that women who received the MSSW after marriage spent more post-graduation time in the work force than those who received MSSW's before marriage.

When asked whether or not they prefer full-time employment, the re-entry women's responses were similar to those of single, divorced or separated, and widowed women. While only 53 percent of all married women preferred full-time employment, 87 percent of the re-entry women, 91 percent of the single women and 89 percent of the divorced, separated or widowed women preferred full-time employment.

Retirement Plans

Most re-entry women (71 percent) reported they plan to work until retirement, though a substantial number (29 percent) were unsure they would work until retirement (see Table 2). They appeared to be less likely than men, single women or divorced, separated or widowed women to plan to work until retirement, but more likely than all married women or younger groups of alumni to plan to work until retirement.

Social Work Method Occupying Most Time

As Table 3 indicates, most re-entry respondents (68 percent) were engaged in social work treatment jobs, while 23 percent held administrative positions and nine percent were engaged in other social work activities. In this respect, they most resembled alumnae from the youngest and oldest age groups. Their age correspondents in the 40's to 50's range were less likely to hold treatment jobs and more likely to be involved in administration and planning.

One might speculate on the reasons for this pattern by asking, do re-entry women wish to continue their nurturing roles in direct service positions or do they take entry-level jobs because they lack experience? The survey showed that few women move into administrative positions before age 40, and it is presumed these women have many years of experience. It would be interesting to repeat the Alumni Survey in five or ten years to see whether or not the majority of re-entry women remain in treatment positions.

Salary

As Table 5 indicates, salaries of re-entry women were roughly comparable to other alumni. The mean salary for re-entry women was $14,773, compared with a mean salary for all women of $15,974.

The mean salary for re-entry women in treatment positions was $14,477 although two out of three in the $20,000 to $24,000 salary range were engaged in direct service. The mean salary for re-entry women in administration and planning positions was $17,062.

Re-entry women seemed to have a slight earnings advantage over their younger classmates who had similar experience. When re-entry women who received their MSSW in 1970 or later were compared with women who received their degrees before age 30 during the same time period, the mean salary for re-entry women was $14,190 and the mean for the younger women was $13,689.

SUMMARY

The Alumni Survey findings did not disclose clear indications of the changing status of women in social work. Although most young, female respondents were actively engaged in the profession, this was clouded by the finding that many of them will consider leaving the work force at some point in their careers. If the status of women in social work is changing, those changes were not apparent from this study. Differences in male and female alumni employment patterns and salaries resembled findings in other studies of professional social workers: women, particularly those who are married, spend fewer years in the work force than men and are likely to work part-time; men most often hold administrative positions and earn higher salaries than women, most of whom are active in social work treatment positions.

Clearer conclusions can be drawn from the sample of re-entry alumnae and these can possibly be generalized for similar female graduates from other schools. Re-entry women appear to be a stable source of social work manpower. The Tennessee re-entry women's employment

experience adds weight to similar studies but is also more convincing because they have had an average of eight years work experience. Re-entry women are also more likely to plan to work until retirement than younger alumnae. These professional women fill positions vacated by other social workers who choose to retire from the work force and they provide a valuable resource for the social work profession.

NOTES

1. From Council on Social Work Education, Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1976, 1977, 1978. New York, (1978).

   From Sales, E., Shore, B. & Bolitho, F. When Mothers Return to School. Paper presented at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, New Orleans, March 1978.

REFERENCES

Belon, C.J. & Gould, K.H. Not Even Equals: Sex Related Salary Inequities. Social Work, 1977, 22, 466-471.

Chafetz, J.S. Women in Social Work. Social Work, 1972, 17, 12-18.

Fanshel, D. Status Differentials: Men and Women in Social Work. Social Work, 1976, 21, 448-454.

Herberg, D.C. A Study of Work Participation by Graduate Female Social Workers: Some Implications for Professional Social Work Training. Journal of Education for Social Work, 1973, 9:3, 16-23.

Knopman, S.K. Sex Discrimination in Family Agencies. Social Work, 1977, 22, 461-465.

Ozawa, M.N. Women and Work. Social Work, 1976, 21, 455-462.

Scotch, C.B. Sex Status in Social Work: Grist for Women's Liberation. Social Work, 1971, 16, 5-11.

Stamm, A.M. NASW Membership: Characteristics, Deployment and Salaries. Personnel Information, 1969, 12(3), 34-45.

Williams, M., Ho, L., and Fielder, L. Career Patterns: More Grist for Women's Liberation. Social Work, 1974, 19, 463-466.

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK ALUMNI SURVEY*

*Developed from the Alumni Survey of the University of Michigan School of Social Work

77

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alumni of the UT School of Social Work

FROM: Ronald K. Green, Director, Office of Continuing Social Work Education

RE: Alumni Survey

DATE: June 1, 1978

The School of Social Work is requesting your cooperation in completing the enclosed survey.

The survey is intended primarily to identify ways to improve the School's graduate educational program and to strengthen our ability to serve our graduates. A secondary use of the survey data may be in contributing to the School's ongoing research in social work manpower.

Your participation will provide the information necessary to increase the relevance of the School's programs to the practice field. We recognize that the questionnaire is lengthy and appreciate the time you will spend in completing it. The survey is designed as a self-mailer—no postage is required. After completing the questionnaire, fold the inside back flap over the front of the survey, staple, or tape and drop it in the mail. Please return the questionnaire by June 30, 1978.

In returning the completed form, you are granting the School your permission to use the data for the purposes described above. The data will be reported in aggregate form and in such a way as to retain the confidentiality of individual responses. Analysis of the responses is anticipated to be completed this summer. The survey findings will be summarized in the Fall or Winter *Stimulus*, and more detailed reports will be available on request at a later date.

We are counting on UTSSW alumni to improve on the good response that the University of Michigan received in its survey. Thank you for your help.

CODE NUMBER _____

1. Since receiving the MSSW, have you ever been employed as a social worker?

___ (1) Yes ___ (2) No (If no, describe job and title and skip to q. 45)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What is your current employment status and hours/week worked? (Reply for major job if more than one held.)

___ (1) Employed full time in social work ___ hrs/wk
___ (2) Employed part time in social work ___ hrs/wk
___ (3) Not employed by choice
___ (4) Not employed but looking
___ (5) Employed but not in social work ___ hrs/wk
___ (6) Other explain. _____

If you checked **1** *or* **2** *in q. 2, please answer the following questions about your current employment. If you checked* **3**, **4** *or* **5** *in q. 2 (that is, you are not currently employed in social work), skip to q. 26.*

3. List job title and describe your responsibilities. _____

_____

_____

_____

4. What is the setting in which you are currently employed? (Check the one category which is most appropriate.)

(01) ___ Alcohol abuse
(02) ___ Aged
(03) ___ Child guidance
(04) ___ Child welfare
(05) ___ College-university
(06) ___ Community action-poverty
(07) ___ Community center-settlement house
(08) ___ Community mental health
(09) ___ Corrections
(10) ___ Council planning
(11) ___ Courts
(12) ___ Family agency
(13) ___ Handicapped
(14) ___ Health
(15) ___ Hospital, mental
(16) ___ Minority group organization
(17) ___ Narcotics
(18) ___ Public welfare
(19) ___ Residential institution
(20) ___ School
(21) ___ Vocational rehabilitation
(22) ___ Youth service
(23) ___ Private practice
(24) ___ Other (Please specify.)

_____

_____

1

5. What are the auspices of your current employment? (Check one.)

___ (1) Public Title XX
___ (2) Public-Non-Title XX
___ (3) Private non-profit
___ (4) Private profit
___ (5) Combined public/private
___ (6) Other (Please specify.) _____

6. How many other MSW's are employed at the same institution or same local agency (e.g., local school systems, local department of social services) are you are?

___ (1) None (If none, please skip to q. 8.)
___ (2) 1 to 3
___ (3) 4 to 6
___ (4) 7 or more
___ (5) Don't know

7. How many of those MSW's were trained in the same social work method as you were (e.g., Casework, Group Work, Social Treatment, Administration and Planning, etc.)?

___ (1) None
___ (2) 1 to 3
___ (3) 4 to 6
___ (4) 7 or more
___ (5) Don't know

8. Which social work method(s) do you use often in your current job? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Casework
___ (2) Group Work
___ (3) Family Therapy
___ (4) Community Practice
___ (5) Administration
___ (6) Policy Formulation and Analysis
___ (7) Research
___ (8) Other (Please specify.) _____

9. Which of the above methods occupies most of your time? (Enter the number of the method from q. 8.) _____

10. What major activities do you perform in your current job? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

___ (01) Direct service to individual clients
___ (02) Direct service to groups of unrelated clients
___ (03) Direct service to clients meeting in family groups
___ (04) Acting as a client advocate
___ (05) Staff development and training
___ (06) Supervising other staff members
___ (07) Offering consultation to staff members
___ (08) Attending staff meetings
___ (09) Budgeting/financial planning
___ (10) Writing proposals for funding
___ (11) Fund raising
___ (12) Planning and carrying out research
___ (13) Writing (reports, papers, articles, etc.)
___ (14) Helping to develop new programs
___ (15) Offering consultation to other agencies
___ (16) Meeting with representatives of community agencies
___ (17) Organizing community groups
___ (18) Meeting with community groups
___ (19) Meeting with public officials
___ (20) Teaching
___ (21) Direct service to caregivers (e.g., foster mothers, teachers, ministers, etc.)
___ (22) Other (Please specify.) _____

11. To which one of the major activities checked in q. 10 do you give the most time in your current job? (Enter the number of the task from q. 10.) _____

12. How closely are you supervised in your current job? (Check one.)

___ (1) Closely supervised
___ (2) Not closely supervised
___ (3) Not supervised at all

13. Do you supervise anyone who is performing social work activities in your current job?

____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No (If no, please skip to q. 18.)

14. How many such persons do you supervise? (Enter number.) ____

15. Of the persons you supervise, how many have MSSW's? (Enter number.) ____

16. Of the persons you supervise, how many are non-MSSW social workers? (Enter number.) ____

17. Of the persons you supervise, how many are MSW students? (Enter number.) ____

18. What is your current yearly salary (at a full-time rate)?

____ (1) Under $7,999
____ (2) $ 8,000 - $ 8,999
____ (3) $ 9,000 - $ 9,999
____ (4) $10,000 - $11,999
____ (5) $12,000 - $13,999
____ (6) $14,000 - $15,999
____ (7) $16,000 - $17,999
____ (8) $18,000 - $19,999
____ (09) $20,000 - $24,999
____ (10) $25,000 - $29,999
____ (11) $30,000 and above

19. In which city and state is your current job located? _____

20. Do you plan to work until retirement age? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No ____ (3) Don't know

21. Are you covered by a retirement plan? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No

22. Do you plan to seek promotion and/or more responsibility in the future? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No

23. In what type of community is your current job located? (Check one.)

____ (1) Urban, low-income
____ (2) Urban, non-low income
____ (3) Suburban area
____ (4) Small city
____ (5) Semi-rural area
____ (6) Rural area

24. How many different job positions (including jobs with different job titles and responsibilities in the same agency) have you held since graduation? ____

25. Is your current social work job the first job as a social worker that you held after receiving the MSSW?

____ (1) Yes (If yes, please skip to q. 45.) ____ (2) No

Please answer questions 26-44 only if your current job is not your first job as a social worker since receiving the MSSW.

26. What was your job title and what were the major responsibilities in your social work job?

_____

_____

27. Was your first post-MSSW social work job a full-time one? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No (If no, list hrs/week ____)

28. What was the setting in which you were employed in your first post-MSSW social work job? (Check the one category which is most appropriate.)

(01) ___ Alcohol abuse
(02) ___ Aged
(03) ___ Child guidance
(04) ___ Child welfare
(05) ___ College-university
(06) ___ Community action-poverty
(07) ___ Community center-settlement house
(08) ___ Community mental health
(09) ___ Corrections
(10) ___ Council Planning
(11) ___ Courts
(12) ___ Family agency
(13) ___ Handicapped
(14) ___ Health
(15) ___ Hospital, mental
(16) ___ Minority group organization
(17) ___ Narcotics
(18) ___ Public welfare
(19) ___ Residential institution
(20) ___ School
(21) ___ Vocational rehabilitation
(22) ___ Youth service
(23) ___ Private practice
(24) ___ Other (Please specify.) _____

29. What were the auspices of your first post-MSSW social work job?

___ (1) Public-Title XX
___ (2) Public-Non-Title XX
___ (3) Private non-profit
___ (4) Private profit
___ (5) Combined public/private
___ (6) Other (Please specify.) _____

30. How many other MSSW's were employed at the same institution or same local agency as you were on your first post-MSSW social work job (e.g., local school system, local department of social services)?

___ (1) None (If none, please skip to q. 32.)
___ (2) 1 to 3
___ (3) 4 to 6
___ (4) 7 or more
___ (5) Don't know

31. How many of those MSSW's were trained in the same method as you were?

___ (1) None ___ (2) 1 to 3 ___ (3) 4 to 6 ___ (4) 7 or more ___ (5) Don't know

32. Which social work method(s) did you use often in your first post-MSSW social work job? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Casework
___ (2) Group work
___ (3) Family therapy
___ (4) Community practice
___ (5) Administration
___ (6) Policy formulation and analysis
___ (7) Research
___ (8) Other (Please specify.)

33. Which of the above methods occupied most of your time? (Enter the number of the method from q. 32.) _____

34. What major activities did you perform in your first post-MSSW social work job? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

___ (01) Direct service to individual clients
___ (02) Direct service to groups of unrelated clients
___ (03) Direct service to clients meeting in family groups
___ (04) Acting as a client advocate
___ (05) Staff development and training
___ (06) Supervising other staff members

___ (07) Offering consultation to staff members
___ (08) Attending staff meetings
___ (09) Budgeting/financial planning
___ (10) Writing proposals for funding
___ (11) Fund raising
___ (12) Planning and carrying out research
___ (13) Writing (reports, papers, articles, etc.)
___ (14) Helping to develop new programs
___ (15) Offering consultation to other agencies
___ (16) Meeting with representatives of community agencies
___ (17) Organizing community groups
___ (18) Meeting with community groups
___ (19) Meeting with public officials
___ (20) Teaching
___ (21) Direct service to caregivers (e.g. foster mothers, teachers, ministers, etc.)
___ (22) Other (Please specify.) _____

35. Which of the major activities you checked in q. 34 would you rank as the most time consuming aspects of your first post-MSSW social work job? (Enter the number of these tasks from q. 34.) ___

36. How closely were you supervised in your first post-MSSW social work job? (Check one)

___ (1) Closely supervised ___ (2) Not closely supervised ___ (3) Not supervised at all

37. Did you supervise anyone who was performing social work activities in your first post-MSSW social work job?

___ (1) Yes ___ (2) No (If no, please skip to q. 42.)

38. How many such persons did you supervise? (Enter number.) ___

39. Of the persons you supervised, how many had MSSWs? (Enter number.) ___

40. Of the persons you supervised, how many were non-MSSW social workers? (Enter number.) ___

41. Of the persons you supervised, how many were MSW students? (Enter number.) ___

42. What was your starting salary at your first post MSSW social work job (at a full-time rate)?

___ (1) Under $7,999
___ (2) $ 8,000 - $ 8,999
___ (3) $ 9,000 - $ 9,999
___ (4) $10,000 - $11,999
___ (5) $12,000 - $13,999
___ (6) $14,000 - $15,999
___ (7) $16,000 - $17,999
___ (8) $18,000 - $19,999
___ (09) $20,000 - $24,999
___ (10) $25,000 - $29,999
___ (11) $30,000 and above

43. In which city and state was your first post-MSW social work job?

_____

44. In what type of community was your first post-MSSW social work job located?

___ (1) Urban, low-income
___ (2) Urban, non-low income
___ (3) Suburban area
___ (4) Small city
___ (5) Semi-rural area
___ (6) Rural area

45. Did you receive your MSSW in 1975 or earlier? ___ (1) Yes ___ (2) No

The following group of questions pertain to an evaluation of The University of Tennessee MSSW Curriculum.

46. **Please evaluate** the following curriculum areas and courses in terms of their helpfulness to you with 5 *being the highest rating and* 1 *being the lowest.* (Circle your rating. N/A (not applicable) is to be circled if you did not take courses .n that area.)

Curriculum Area	Helpfulness					
	High				Low	
(01) Field (use applicable one only): 1st and 2nd year regular program	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1st and 2nd year accelerated program	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(02) Classes in general	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(03) Non-specialized core-integrated practice methods courses (if applicable)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(04) Social work treatment with individuals and families (e.g., casework, marital counselor, family therapy, and other individual and family treatment courses)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(05) Social work treatment with groups (e.g., group work and group treatment courses)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(06) Non-specialized core research courses.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(07) Non-specialized core administration and planning courses	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(03) Administration and planning courses in general	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(09) Management courses (e.g., management, finance, information, complex organizations, resources, planning)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(10) Community organization	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(11) Advanced policy courses (e.g., legislative process, policy analysis, policy practicum)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(12) Research courses in general (e.g., practicum, reading, evaluative)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(13) Other courses taken within the School of Social Work in general (not continuing education)						
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Curriculum Area	Helpfulness					
	High				Low	
(14) UTSSW continuing education courses						
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
(15) Courses taken outside of the School of Social Work (at the same time as or after the MSSW)						
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Title: _____	5	4	3	2	1	NA

47. What course content or specific course(s) that you did not take do you think would have been helpful to you? (In responding to this question, include courses that were being offered that you did not take, courses you could not get into, and course content that was not being offered when you were a student.)

_____

_____

_____

48. Which two courses have been the most helpful to you?

(1) _____ (2) _____

Why? (Check as many reasons below as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Knowledge gained
___ (2) Skill(s) learned
___ (3) Both knowledge and skills
___ (4) Personal effect instructor had on you
___ (5) Material relevant to practice world
___ (6) Other (Please specify.)

_____

_____

_____

Why? (Check as many reasons below as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Knowledge gained
___ (2) Skill(s) learned
___ (3) Both knowledge and skills
___ (4) Personal effect instructor had on you
___ (5) Material relevant to practice world
___ (6) Other (Please specify.)

_____

_____

_____

49. Which two courses have been the least helpful to you?

(1) _____ (2) _____

Why? (Check as many reasons below as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Material irrelevant to practice world
___ (2) Not part of my professional interests
___ (3) Poor instructor
___ (4) Other (Please specify.)
_____
_____
_____

Why? (Check as many reasons below as are appropriate.)

___ (1) Material irrelevant to practice world
___ (2) Not part of my professional interests
___ (3) Poor instructor
___ (4) Other (Please specify.)
_____
_____
_____

The following questions ask for some facts about you.

50. Through which process did you enter the School of Social Work?
___ (1) Summer Accelerated ___ (2) Part-Time (If part-time, for how many years?) ___ ___ (3) Regular Two Year

51. From which Branch did you graduate? ___ (1) Knoxville ___ (2) Memphis ___ (3) Nashville

52. Date degree was awarded? _____

53. In which method did you specialize at the School of Social Work?

___ (1) Social work treatment (includes casework and/or group work)
___ (2) Administration and planning (includes community organization)
___ (3) Dual specialization (the new joint-methods program)

54. What was the field of practice of your first year of field instruction? (Check the one category which is most appropriate.)

(01) ___ Services to children
(02) ___ Corrections
(03) ___ School social work
(04) ___ Mental health
(05) ___ Medical social work
(06) ___ Services to families
(07) ___ Social work education
(08) ___ Mental retardation
(09) ___ Services to aged
(10) ___ Community work
(11) ___ Public welfare
(12) ___ Community mental health
(13) ___ Other (Please specify.)
_____

55. What was the field of practice of your second year of field instruction? (Enter the most appropriate number from q. 54.)
___

56. How much full-time work experience did you have in social work or human services prior to entering the School of Social Work? (Check one and if part-time, transform into equivalent full-time work)

(1) ___ None
(2) ___ Less than 6 months
(3) ___ 6 months to 1 year
(4) ___ 1 year to 18 months
(5) ___ 18 months to 2 years
(6) ___ Over 2 years

57. Did you transfer from another School of Social Work? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No

58. What was your age upon receiving the MSSW?

____ (1) Under 24
____ (2) 24 to 26
____ (3) 27 to 29
____ (4) 30 to 32
____ (5) 33 to 35
____ (6) 36 to 38
____ (7) 39 to 41
____ (8) Over 41

59. What is your sex? ____ (1) Female ____ (2) Male

60. What is your current marital status?

____ (1) Married
____ (2) Single
____ (3) Divorced, Separated
____ (4) Widowed

61. How many children do you have and what are their ages?

(1) ____ (Age) (2) ____ (Age) (3) ____ (Age) (4) ____ (Age) (5) ____ (Age) (6) ____ (Age)

62. What is your present age? ____ (Years)

63. What is your race and/or ethnicity? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

____ (1) Asian-American
____ (2) Black
____ (3) Chicano
____ (4) Native American (Indian)
____ (5) Puerto Rican
____ (6) White
____ (7) Foreign (Please specify.) _____
____ (8) Other (Please specify.) _____

64. In which city and state did you reside prior to entering the University of Tennessee School of Social Work?

_____

65. To which professional organizations do you currently belong? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

____ (1) National Association of Social Workers
____ (2) National Association of Black Social Workers
____ (3) American Orthopsychiatric Association
____ (4) National Conference of Social Welfare
____ (5) Child Welfare League of America
____ (6) American Public Welfare Association
____ (7) Council on Social Work Education
____ (8) Other (Please specify.) _____
_____
_____
_____
____ (9) None

Please complete the following questions about your current job performance, being as objective as possible. If you are not currently employed in social work, please skip to q. 68.

66. Using a typical or average MSSW with your level of experience as a base of comparison, please check the box which you think is appropriate concerning your current job performance as a social worker.

	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Outstanding
(01) Knowledge of theory				
(02) Skill in applying theory to practice				
(03) Skill in use of supervision and/or consultation				
(04) Skill in functioning as a supervisor and/or consultant				
(05) Skill in realistically assessing changes needed in the agency				
(06) Skill in realistically assessing own strengths and areas needing strenthening				
(07) Skill in problems assessment				
(08) Skill in goal attainment				
(09) Skill in using resources (community agencies, colleagues, volunteers, etc.)				
(10) Enthusiasm displayed for job				
(11) Reliability in meeting administrative requirements of job (recording, attending meetings, etc.)				
(12) Overall effectiveness in performance				
(13) Skill in working with other staff members				

	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Outstanding
(14) Skill in relating to different types of people				
(15) Productivity				
(16) Skill in adapting to new situations				
(17) Openness to change, new ideas, etc.				

67. Did you receive financial assistance from any of the following sources during your first year in the School of Social work? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

___ (01) Veterans Administration Grant
___ (02) NIMH Grant in Administration
___ (03) NIMH Grant in Aging
___ (04) NIMH Grant in Corrections
___ (05) NIMH Grant in Community Mental Health
___ (06) NIMH Grant in Community Organization
___ (07) NIMH Grant in Psychiatric Social Work
___ (08) NIMH Grant in School Social Work
___ (09) Social Rehabilitation Services Grant in Child Welfare
___ (10) Social Rehabilitation Services Grant in Rehabilitation
___ (11) Social Rehabilitation Services Grant in Mental Retardation
___ (12) Social Rehabilitation Services Grant in Aging
___ (13) Other (Please specify.) _____

_____

68. Did you receive financial assistance from any of the above sources during your second year in the School of Social Work? (Enter the number from the appropriate category in q. 67.) _____

69. If you are currently employed as a social worker, how satisfied are you in your job? (If you are not currently employed as a social worker, please check "Not applicable.")

___ (1) Very satisfied ___ (3) Somewhat satisfied ___ (5) Not at all satisfied
___ (2) Quite satisfied ___ (4) Not very satisfied ___ (6) Not applicable

70. Do you prefer to work full-time as opposed to part-time? ___ (1) Yes ___ (2) No

71. Have you received another degree since the MSSW? ___ (1) Yes ___ (2) No

If yes, explain. _____

_____

72. In general, how satisfied are you with your UTSSW educational experience as preparation for your post-MSSW career?

____ (1) Very satisfied
____ (2) Quite satisfied
____ (3) Somewhat satisfied
____ (4) Not very satisfied
____ (5) Not at all satisfied

73. The UTSSW Office of Continuing Education offers courses in social work to further professional interests and competence. If further education is of interest to you, please indicate what courses, workshops, etc. you would like to see offered.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

74. If you are not currently enrolled in a doctoral program in social work (DSW or PhD), how interested are you in doing so in the future?

____ (1) Very interested
____ (2) Quite interested
____ (3) Somewhat interested
____ (4) Not very interested
____ (5) Not at all interested

75. If you have an interest in doctoral studies in social work, would you be interested in such a program at UTSSW if one were developed?

____ (1) Very interested
____ (2) Quite interested
____ (3) Somewhat interested
____ (4) Not very interested
____ (5) Not at all interested

76. As an alumnus, would you like further service from the School? ____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No

77. If yes, what kind of service? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

____ (1) Job placement
____ (2) Certificate program in clinical practice
____ (3) Certificate program in social work management
____ (4) Workshops
____ (5) Summer Institute
____ (6) Other _____

****

Any comments you wish to make about the questionnaire, your employment experience, the curriculum at the School of Social Work, or any topic at all are welcome.